1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	
10	WILLIAM LEON MAROTZ, No. C-13-01677 DMR
11	Plaintiff(s), ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
12	v.
13	CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO ET AL,
14	Defendant(s).
15	
16	Defendant City of San Francisco has filed a motion to dismiss all of Plaintiff's claims
17	pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). [Docket No. 26.] Currently, the motion is set
18	for a court hearing on October 31, 2013. Plaintiff is pursuing this action without legal representation
19	According to the local rules, Plaintiff should have filed any brief in opposition to the motion by October 2, 2013. <i>See</i> N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 7-3. The court has received no such opposition.
20	The court ORDERS Plaintiff to respond by October 21, 2013 and explain his failure to
	respond to the motion. In addition, Plaintiff must simultaneously (1) submit his opposition to the
21	court or (2) file a statement of non-opposition to the motion. This order to show cause does not
	indicate that the court will necessarily accept Plaintiff's late submission. If Plaintiff does not respond by October 21, 2013, Defendant's motion may be granted and the case may be dismissed for failure
23	to prosecute.
24	The court further ORDERS that Defendant shall file a reply, if any, to Plaintiff's opposition
25	no later than October 28, 2013. The hearing date remains unchanged.
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.
27	Dated: October 8, 2013
28	DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge